



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/686,356

10/14/2003

Shaun P. Cooley

20423-08165

6704

34415

7590

05/28/2010

SYMANTEC/ FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

KIM, TAE K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2453

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/28/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptoc@fenwick.com
bhoffman@fenwick.com
aprice@fenwick.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/686,356 | Applicant(s) COOLEY, SHAUN P. | |
| | Examiner TAE K. KIM | Art Unit 2453 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7-9,11,14-19 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7-9,11,14-19 and 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the Applicant's response filed on February 16, 2010. Claims 1, 2, 17, 22, and 24 have been amended by the Applicant. Claims 12 and 20 have been cancelled by the Applicant. Claims 25 and 26 have been added by the Applicant. Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 9, 11, 14 – 19, and 21 – 26, where Claims 1, 16, and 18 are in independent form, are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on February 16, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued:

- a) Regarding Claims 1, 16, and 18, the cited references do not teach or suggest that the locating is "responsive to at least one of the foreground color and the background color being a gray-scale color, deeming the difference between the colors to be negligible based on a comparison of saturation and brightness values of the colors regardless of hue values of the colors."
- b) Regarding Claim 2, the cited references do not teach or suggest of "setting a negligibility threshold such that, when the difference between the foreground color and background color is below the negligibility threshold for a certain portion of the electronic message, said portion is invisible or nearly invisible to a typical human viewer of the electronic message."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions.

1. With regards to a), the Applicant acknowledges that Ralston discloses of removing "hidden" information from a message [See Remarks, Pg. 10, 2nd Para.]. Yet, the Applicant states that Ralston does not provide any further details on "hidden information" or the identification of such information [Id.]. The cited passage specifically gives one example of how to identify "hidden information," such as white text on a white background. "Hidden information" is further described in Ralston as "anything that is not visible to the user when reading the message" [Id.].

The Applicant further argues that Wuyts is "concerned with determining a color code of an object, not with comparing colors" [See Remarks, Pg. 10, 3rd Para.]. The Wuyts reference is used to disclose that the determination of a color or color code comprises of comparing the saturation, hue, and brightness values of the object in question [See Abstract]. Furthermore, Wuyts does compare colors with predetermined reference values to determine the color [Id.].

The Applicant further asserts that Wuyts determines a grey color purely based on its brightness value [See Remarks, Pg. 10, 3rd Para.]. The Applicant selectively cites Col. 4, lines 10-15 to support assertion, while the rest of the paragraph clearly discloses the comparison of saturation value [See Fig. 5, Col. 4, lines 6-10]. While it is accurate that saturation is not taken into account when determining if a color is a particular type of gray, the saturation value is check within the color comparison steps as disclosed above.

Furthermore, the Applicant's specification clearly defines "gray-scale color" as a color "having a saturation of zero percent" [See Spec. Pg. 6, lines 23-24]. The specification further states that a color is either a hue color or a gray-scale color [See Spec. Pg. 6, line 26]. How can the saturation value of various gray-scale colors be compared to each other when all gray-scale color has a saturation of zero percent? Once it is determined to be a gray-scale color, based on the saturation value, brightness must be used to distinguish between various gray-scale colors as indicated in Wuyts [See Fig. 5]. This understanding is further supported by the Applicant's specification stating that brightness is "that attribute of color which measures its position on the white to black scale" [See Spec, Pg. 6, lines 17-22]. The specification further describes the various tones of gray, such as dark gray [Id.]. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim in light of the specification, the saturation value is compared in the beginning to determine if the color is a gray-scale color. As stated above, Wuyts discloses the comparison of saturation value as indicated above. Without more, the claims do not distinguish over the prior art of record.

2. With regards to b), Applicant acknowledges that Ralston discloses of removing "hidden" information from a message [See Remarks, Pg. 10, 2nd Para.]. Yet, the Applicant states that Ralston does not provide any further details on "hidden information" or the identification of such information [Id.]. The cited passage specifically gives one example of how to identify "hidden information," such as white text on a white background. "Hidden information" is further described in Ralston as "anything that is not visible to the user when reading the message" [Id.].

The term "negligibility threshold" is not described within the claim as a certain value or to hold a specific definition. The fact that white text on a white background is removed from the email is sufficient to indicate that white text on a white background is below a certain threshold as determined within the Ralston system. Without more, the claims do not distinguish over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the negligibility threshold" where Claim 1 does not disclose of such a limitation or even how to determine, set, or define such a limitation.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4. Regarding Claims 16, 17, and 22, in view of Applicant's disclosure, the medium is not limited solely to tangible embodiments [See Spec. Pg. 8, lines 8-14]. The claimed

Art Unit: 2453

subject matter, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, may be a carrier wave comprising of instructions and is, therefore, non-statutory. The phrase “such as” does not specifically exclude the use of carrier waves for storing information.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is obliged to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during proceedings before the USPTO. *See In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (during patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals *per se* in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent. *See* MPEP 2111.01.

When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal *per se*, the claim must be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter. *See In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter) and *Interim Examination Instructions for Evaluating Subject Matter Eligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101*, Aug. 24, 2009; p. 2.

To overcome this type of 101 rejection, the claims need to be amended to include only the physical computer media (e.g. *non-transitory* computer readable *storage* medium) and to be unassociated with any transmission media or other intangible or non-functional media.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, 11, 14 – 19, 21 – 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,842,773, invented by Geoffrey D. Ralston et al. (hereinafter "Ralston"), in view of U.S. Patent 5,751,847, invented by Robert Wuyts (hereinafter "Wuyts")

5. Regarding Claims 1, 16, and 18, Ralston discloses a method for countering spam that disguises characters within an electronic message, the method implemented on a computer [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15], the said method comprising the steps of:

locating portions of the electronic message where the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible, the locating performed by a processor of the computer [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or other HTML information], the locating comprising:

determining whether at least one of the foreground color and the background color is a gray-scale color [[Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or other HTML information]; and

responsive to at least one of the foreground color and the background color being a gray-scale color, deeming the difference between the colors to be negligible [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or other HTML information]; deleting from the electronic message foreground characters from said portions, to form a redacted electronic message [[Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or other HTML information]; and

forwarding the redacted electronic message to a spam filter [[Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; the visible text body is loaded into a word array to determine if the message is unsolicited (spam)].

Ralston, however, does not specifically disclose that the deeming the difference between the colors to be negligible is based on a comparison of saturation and brightness values of the colors regardless of hue values of the colors.

Wuyts discloses an image processing method for determining the color or color code based on the brightness, saturation, and hue levels [Fig. 5; Abstract]. Wuyts further discloses that the brightness value of the examined color is first determined, then the saturation value of the examined color to determine if the color is colorless [Fig. 5]. If the color is determined to be colorless, only the brightness level of the color is evaluated until a specific gray-scale is determined for the examined color; the hue value

Art Unit: 2453

is not determined for gray-scale colors [Fig. 5]. Therefore, if either the foreground or background color is a gray-scale color, the Wuyts method would only have determined the brightness and saturation values for that particular foreground and/or background image and a comparison hue values will not be irrelevant.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Wuyts to Ralston by incorporating the method of determining the brightness and saturation values of the evaluated message before the hue values within the converting component to eliminate words that were determined to be essentially invisible in the message. The Wuyts color determination method is implemented in software form and can readily be coded into the converting component of Ralston.

The motivation to do so is to simplify the comparing between the foreground and background color of the message by eliminating the hue value determination when either the foreground or background color is a gray-scale color. Doing so will simplify the comparing process under certain situations to two values instead of three values, which reduces the load on the processor handling this comparison process.

6. Regarding Claims 2 and 23, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Ralston further discloses of setting a negligibility threshold such that when the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible for a certain portion of the electronic message [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or

Art Unit: 2453

other HTML information], said portion is invisible or nearly invisible to a typical human viewer of the electronic message [[Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; hidden information is anything that is not visible to the user when reading the message].

7. Regarding Claims 3, 9, and 17, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 16 above. Wuyts further discloses that, responsive to neither the foreground color nor the background color being a gray-scale color, the color determination step includes determining the hue, saturation, and brightness [Fig. 5].

8. Regarding Claims 7 and 8, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Neither Ralston nor Wuyts specifically disclose of determining whether or not the differences in brightness, saturation, or hue between the foreground and background are negligible based on certain percentages.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. *"the negligibility of an electronic message can be determined if there are small percentage differences in the brightness, saturation, and hue of the foreground to the background,"* are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Furthermore, the percentage differences in saturation, brightness, and hue to determine whether or not the text is negligible can vary depending on the designer's

Art Unit: 2453

preferences. To determine if the difference between the foreground and background color is negligible when: a) the difference in saturation between foreground and background is less than 5% and the difference in brightness between foreground and background is less than 4%, or b) the difference in saturation between foreground and background is less than 3% and the difference in brightness between foreground and background is less than 2%, would have been a designer's choice in implementing the system taught by Ralston, in view of Wuyts.

9. Regarding Claim 11, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 9 above. Neither Ralston nor Wuyts specifically disclose of determining whether or not the differences in brightness, saturation, or hue between the foreground and background are negligible based on certain degrees and percentages.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. *"the negligibility of an electronic message can be determined if there are small percentage differences in the brightness, saturation, and hue of the foreground to the background,"* are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Furthermore, the percentage or degrees of differences in saturation, brightness, and hue to determine whether or not the text is negligible can vary depending on the

Art Unit: 2453

designer's preferences. To determine if the difference between the foreground and background color is negligible when the difference in hue between foreground and background is less than 4 degrees and the combined difference in saturation and brightness values of the foreground and background is less than 12%, would have been a designer's choice in implementing the system taught by Ralston, in view of Wuyts.

10. Regarding Claim 15, Ralston discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Ralston further discloses that the electronic message consists of e-mail [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message], and the locating step comprises using a HTML parser [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; hidden information can be white text on a white background or other HTML information].

11. Regarding Claim 19, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 18 above. Ralston further discloses that the locating step comprises using a color comparison module [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; hidden information can be white text on a white background].

12. Regarding Claim 14, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Ralston further discloses that the spam filter is responsive to characters within the electronic message [Fig. 6B and 6D; spam filter screens the message for key words to determine if the message is unsolicited].

13. Regarding Claims 21 and 22, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claims 1 and 16 above. Wuyts further discloses that the saturation value is compared to a reference value to determine if that particular color is one of gray-scale color [Fig. 5]. Since the designer of the comparison module in Ralston will determine

Art Unit: 2453

the reference value, it would have been the designer's choice to select the reference value to be so that the saturation value of the examined color is be zero to be determined to be one of gray-scale color.

14. Regarding Claim 26, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 above. Ralston further discloses of locating color tags in the electronic message, the color tags specifying foreground and background colors [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or other HTML information; white text and white background specifies foreground and background colors], and dividing the electronic message into portions based on the color tags, wherein different portions have different foreground or background colors [Fig. 7A; Col. 12, Line 63 - Col. 13, Line 15; system retrieves email message and removes headers or hidden information in the body of the message, such as white text on a white background or other HTML information; "invisible" text is removed].

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston, in view of Wuyts, ,in further view of U.S. Appl. 2002/0113801, filed by Maire Reavy et al. (hereinafter "Reavy").

15. Regarding Claim 4, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 3 above. Neither Ralston nor Wuyts, however, specifically discloses that the red, green, and blue components of the foreground and background colors in the electronic message are converted into hue, saturation, and brightness values.

Reavy discloses that the hue of the foreground and background must be evaluated, including the red, green and blue components of the background and foreground, to determine the legibility of the text to a user on a display [Fig. 1, items 104 and 106; Para. 0010, 0036, 0037]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to evaluate the red, green and blue components of the background and foreground to determine the visibility of text within an electronic message. The electronic message would be viewed by a user on a display terminal and the legibility would be determined by the red, green and blue components to determine the hue of the background and foreground comparisons between the foreground and background. This would allow the determination of whether or not the text within the electronic message is visible to the user.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston, in view of Wuyts, ,in further view of U.S. Appl. 2002/0163527, filed by Dong S. Park (hereinafter "Park").

16. Regarding Claim 24, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 above. Ralston further discloses of setting a negligibility threshold such that when the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible for a certain portion of the electronic message [Para. 0032; if a word or character is rendered as white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible], said portion is invisible or nearly invisible to a typical human viewer of the electronic message [Para. 0033; if these words are included white-on-white color,

Art Unit: 2453

the words may make the message less spam-like according to filters and users would not see them at all].

Wuyts further discloses that the saturation value is compared to a reference value to determine if that particular color is one of gray-scale color [Fig. 5]. Since the designer of the comparison module in Ralston will determine the reference value, it would have been the designer's choice to select the reference value to be so that the saturation value of the examined color equal zero to be determined to be one of gray-scale color.

Neither Ralston nor Wuyts, however, specifically disclose of a negligibility threshold used when the electronic message is displayed on a liquid crystal display (LCD) monitor is different than a negligibility threshold used when the electronic message is displayed on a cathode ray tube (CRT).

Park discloses of a system and method for a user to adjust the display characteristics of a particular monitor based on the type of monitor [Abstract, Figs. 1 and 2]. Park further discloses that the system modifies the brightness and contract values based on whether the monitor is a LCD monitor or a CRT monitor [Para. 0074, 0075]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Park with Ralston and Wuyts to adjust the filtering system to the gray-scale colors of either the LCD monitor or the CRT monitor. The motivation to do so is to adjust the filtering system accordingly to catch "invisible" text since the images viewed by a user of a LCD monitor are different from other monitors will be different for LCD monitors versus another type of monitor, such as a CRT.

Art Unit: 2453

17. Regarding Claim 25, Ralston, in view of Wuyts, discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 above. Ralston further discloses of setting a negligibility threshold such that when the difference between foreground color and background color is negligible for a certain portion of the electronic message [Para. 0032; if a word or character is rendered as white or very light grey text on a white background, the word or character is essentially invisible], said portion is invisible or nearly invisible to a typical human viewer of the electronic message [Para. 0033; if these words are included white-on-white color, the words may make the message less spam-like according to filters and users would not see them at all].

Wuyts further discloses that the saturation value is compared to a reference value to determine if that particular color is one of gray-scale color [Fig. 5]. Since the designer of the comparison module in Ralston will determine the reference value, it would have been the designer's choice to select the reference value to be so that the saturation value of the examined color equal zero to be determined to be one of gray-scale color.

Neither Ralston nor Wuyts, however, specifically disclose that a negligibility threshold used when the electronic message is displayed on a liquid crystal display (LCD) monitor is less than a negligibility threshold used when the electronic message is displayed on a cathode ray tube (CRT) monitor.

Park discloses that if the monitor color adjusting indicates the display is a CRT monitor, the brightness and contrast is set to the maximum values through the user operator part [Para. 0074]. Park further discloses that when the monitor is determined

Art Unit: 2453

to be a LCD monitor, the contrast is set up to the minimum using the user operator part [Para. 0075]. Therefore, Park discloses that the negligibility threshold is less for a LCD monitor than a CRT monitor. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Park with Ralston and Wuyts to adjust the filtering system to the gray-scale colors of either the LCD monitor or the CRT monitor. The motivation to do so is to adjust the filtering system accordingly to catch "invisible" text since the images viewed by a user of a LCD monitor are different from other monitors will be different for LCD monitors versus another type of monitor, such as a CRT.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular figures, columns, line numbers, and/or paragraphs in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae K. Kim, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2979.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tae K. Kim/

Tae K. Kim
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

/Joseph Thomas/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453

May 21, 2010